UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,318	11/26/2001	Shrirang Nilkanth Jambhekar	CML00092H(69606)	7371

22917 7590 01/07/2005

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD
IL01/3RD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER	
PHAN, HUY Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2687	

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/994,318	JAMBHEKAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Huy Q Phan	2687	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 October 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-71* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-47 and 49-71* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *48* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed on date: Oct. 15, 2004.

Claims 1-71 are still pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-71 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 60 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Morita et al. (US-2002/0152115).

Regarding claim 1, Morita et al. disclose a process comprising:

determining that a user in a first geographic zone, which first geographic zone has a first communications service that supports provision of a journey-related

information to the user, is at least likely to leave the first geographic zone and enter a second geographic zone (the restricted zone; [0119]), which second geographic zone does not have the first communications service (Available methods to determine that a vehicle enters the restricted zone are by means of position information as found through the on-board GPS function and through a DSRC on the road side without using HEO [0119]; for more detail see [0015]-[0017]);

downloading to the user at least some journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone (the HEO informs the vehicle that "you are approaching the restricted zone" and that "you will be charged for a sum per a predetermined period of time if you drive through it." [0119]; for more details see [0070]).

Regarding claim 1, Morita et al. disclose the process of claim 1, wherein downloading comprises downloading from a database to the user (fig. 10, DB 14; see [0070].

Regarding claim 60, Morita et al. disclose an apparatus comprising:

determining means for determining that a user in a first geographic zone, which first geographic zone has a first communications service that supports provision of a journey-related information to the user, is at least likely to leave the first geographic zone and enter a second geographic zone (the restricted zone; [0119]), which second geographic zone does not have the first communications service (Available methods to

determine that a vehicle enters the restricted zone are by means of position information as found through the on-board GPS function and through a DSRC on the road side without using HEO [0119]; for more detail see [0015]-[0017]); and

downloading means for downloading to the user at least some journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone (the HEO informs the vehicle that "you are approaching the restricted zone" and that "you will be charged for a sum per a predetermined period of time if you drive through it." [0119]; for more details see [0070]).

Regarding claim 71, Morita et al. disclose a method to provide a terrestrial-based vehicle user, which user uses wirelessly transmitted journey-related information when traveling through a first geographic zone having at least short-range roadside transmitters that transmit journey-related information compatibly with an information service, with journey-related information regarding a second geographic zone (the restricted zone; [0119]) that has at least a considerably reduced number of the short-range roadside transmitters that are operable ([0015]-[0017]), comprising the steps of:

determining that the user is at least likely in the near future to enter the second geographic zone (Available methods to determine that a vehicle enters the restricted zone are by means of position information as found through the on-board GPS function and through a DSRC on the road side without using HEO [0119]; for more detail see [0015]-[0017]);

downloading to the user at least some journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone to provide downloaded journey-related information (the HEO informs the vehicle that "you are approaching the restricted zone" and that "you will be charged for a sum per a predetermined period of time if you drive through it." [0119]; for more details see [0070]);

using at least some of the downloaded journey-related information while traveling through the second geographic zone [0119].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-7, 9-11, 17-19, 22-31, 33, 34, 61-67 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in view of Rauhala (US-6,680,919).

Regarding claims 3 and 61, Morita et al. disclose all the limitations as recited in the rejections of claims 2 and 60, respectively. But, Morita et al. fail to expressly teach wherein downloading from a database to the user at least some journey related information regarding the second geographic zone includes downloading all

journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as is contained in the database. However in analogous art, Rauhala teaches wherein downloading from a database to the user at least some journey related information regarding the second geographic zone includes downloading all journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as is contained in the database (col. 3, lines 30-35 and col. 4, lines 35-45). Since, Morita et al. and Rauhala are related to the method for transmitting information from database to mobile communication device; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. as taught by Rauhala for purpose of providing advantageously all the information to the user at once.

Regarding claims 4 and 62, Morita et al. disclose all the limitations as recited in the rejections of claims 2 and 60, respectively. But, Morita et al. fail to expressly teach wherein downloading from a database to the user at least some journey related information regarding the second geographic zone includes downloading only a portion of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as is contained in the database. However, Rauhala teaches wherein downloading from a database to the user at least some journey related information regarding the second geographic zone includes downloading only a portion of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as is contained in the database (col. 3, lines 30-35 and col. 4, lines 35-45). Since, Morita et al. and Rauhala are related to the method for transmitting information from database to mobile communication device; therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. as taught by Rauhala for purpose of providing advantageously only needed information to the user.

Regarding claim 5, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 4. Rauhala further discloses wherein downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone as is contained in the database includes providing information that corresponds to an anticipated journey path for the user (col. 3, lines 30-35).

Regarding claim 6, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 5. Rauhala further discloses determining the anticipated journey path for the user (col. 3, lines 36-67).

Regarding claim 7, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 6. Rauhala further discloses wherein determining the anticipated journey path for the user includes accessing destination point information as previously provided by the user (col. 3, lines 58-67).

Regarding claim 9, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 4. Rauhala further discloses wherein downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone as is contained in the

database includes downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone as dynamically selected for the user (col. 3, lines 30-35 and col. 4, lines 35-45).

Regarding claim 10, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 9. Rauhala further discloses wherein downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone as dynamically selected for the user includes downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone as dynamically selected by the user at the time of facilitating the downloading (col. 3, lines 30-35 and col. 4, lines 35-45).

Regarding claim 11, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 9. Rauhala further discloses wherein downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone (col. 3, lines 25-35) as dynamically selected for the user includes downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone (col. 2, lines 12-42) as dynamically selected for the user based upon previously stored preferences that are at least partially specific to the user (col. 4, lines 36-45).

Regarding claim 17, Morita et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 1. But, Morita et al. fail to expressly teach wherein downloading comprises wirelessly downloading to the user at least a portion of journey-related information

regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone. However, Rauhala teaches wherein downloading comprises wirelessly downloading to the user at least a portion of journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone (col. 4, lines 7-24); therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. as taught by Rauhala for purpose of providing advantageously only needed information to the user.

Regarding claim 18, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 17. Rauhala further discloses wherein wirelessly downloading includes wirelessly downloading to the user a complete payload of journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone (col. 4, lines 7-24).

Regarding claim 19, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 17. Rauhala further discloses wherein downloading further comprises completing the downloading to the user of all remaining journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is within the second geographic zone and distal to the entrance boundary (col. 4, lines 7-51).

Regarding claims 22 and 63, Morita et al. disclose all the limitations as recited in the rejections of claims 1 and 60, respectively. But, Morita et al. fail to expressly teach wherein downloading comprises downloading to the user at least a portion of journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone using a physical interconnection. However, Rauhala teaches wherein downloading comprises downloading to the user at least a portion of journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone using a physical interconnection (fig. 1, feature 28D and col. 3, lines 24-57); therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. as taught by Rauhala for purpose of offering the physical interconnection technique into the system where the other technique could not be applied.

Regarding claim 23, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 22. Rauhala further discloses wherein using a physical interconnection includes using a portable memory device (inherently to fig. 38, computer 38 and col. 3, lines 24-57).

Regarding claims 24 and 25, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 23. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly disclose wherein using a portable memory device includes using an optically encoded

memory device or an electro-magnetically encoded memory device. However, the examiner takes official notice that the optically encoded memory device and the electro-magnetically encoded memory device are extremely well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically having optically encoded memory device or electro-magnetically encoded memory device in order to increasing the functionality of the system to advantageously store the downloaded information by using optically encoded memory device or electro-magnetically encoded memory device.

Regarding claim 26, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 23. Rauhala further discloses wherein using a portable memory device includes dispensing the portable memory device to the user from a dispensing station (inherently to fig. 1, feature 38 and col. 3, lines 24-57).

Regarding claim 27, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 26. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly disclose wherein dispensing the portable memory device to the user from a dispensing station includes dynamically placing at least part of the journey-related information in the portable memory device for the user. However, Rauhala teaches in figure 1, wherein the system includes a dispensing station (a computer 38), a memory (28C) for storing an operating program and data (col. 3, lines 7-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically having dispensing the portable memory device to the user from a dispensing station includes dynamically placing at least part of the journey-related information in the portable memory device for the user for purpose of allowing the system to advantageously store the downloaded information in the portable memory device in order to save reasonably memory space of portable communication device and increase economically the memory capacity of the system.

Regarding claim 28, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 22. Rauhala further discloses wherein using a physical interconnection (fig. 1, feature 28D) includes using a data conduit (col. 3, lines 24-57).

Regarding claims 29 and 30, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 28. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly disclose wherein using a data conduit includes using an optical conduit or an electrical signal conduit. However, the examiner takes official notice that the optical conduit and the electrical signal conduit are extremely well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically having the optical conduit or the electrical signal conduit for purpose of transferring the data by wire where wireless communication technology cannot be used.

Regarding claim 31, Morita et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 1. But, Morita et al. fail to expressly storing the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone in a memory. However, Rauhala teaches storing the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone in a memory (col. 3, lines 25-35); therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. as taught by Rauhala for purpose of allowing the mobile communication device of capability in storing the needed information for future use.

Regarding claim 33, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 31. Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly disclose comprising automatically removing at least portions of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as the user travels through the second geographic zone. However, Rauhala teaches in figure 1, wherein the system includes a control data processor (28B) a computer (38), a memory (28C) for storing an operating program and data (col. 3, lines 7-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by automatically removing at least portions of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as the user travels through the second geographic zone for purpose of allowing the system to advantageously delete the downloaded information in order to save reasonably memory space of the device.

Regarding claim 34, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 33. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly disclose wherein automatically removing at least portions of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as the user travels through the second geographic zone includes automatically removing portions of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone that correspond to geographic locations that the user has at least reached. However, Rauhala teaches in figure 1, wherein the system includes a control data processor (28B) a computer (38), a memory (28C) for storing an operating program and data (col. 3, lines 7-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by automatically removing at least portions of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as the user travels through the second geographic zone including automatically removing portions of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone that correspond to geographic locations that the user having at least reached for purpose of allowing the system to advantageously delete the downloaded information in order to save reasonably memory space of the device.

Regarding claim 64, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose an apparatus as recited in the rejection of claim 63. Rauhala further discloses wherein the physical connection

means includes portable memory means (obviously in fig. 1, computer 38) for retaining at least some of the information (col. 3, lines 24-57).

Regarding claims 65 and 66, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose an apparatus as recited in the rejection of claim 64. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly disclose wherein the portable memory means includes at least an optically encoded memory device or at least an electro-magnetically encoded memory device. However, the examiner takes official notice that optically encoded memory device and electro-magnetically encoded memory device are extremely well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically having the portable memory means including at least an optically encoded memory device or at least an electro-magnetically encoded memory device in order to increasing the functionality of the system to advantageously store the downloaded information by using optically encoded memory device or electro-magnetically encoded memory device.

Regarding claim 67, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose an apparatus as recited in the rejection of claim 63. Rauhala further discloses wherein the physical connection means (fig. 1, feature 28D) includes a data conduit (col. 3, lines 24-57).

Regarding claim 70, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose an apparatus as recited in the rejection of claim 60. Rauhala further discloses further comprising memory means (fig. 1, feature 12A) operably coupled to the means for downloading for storing at least a part of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone (col. 3, lines 25-36).

6. Claims 8, 12-14 and 49-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in view of Rauhala and further in view of Bahl et al. (US-6,386,454).

Regarding claim 8, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 6. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly disclose wherein determining the anticipated journey path for the user includes estimating the anticipated journey path by referencing historical information regarding the user's travels. However in analogous art, Bahl et al. teach in figure 7B, wherein determining the anticipated journey path for the user includes estimating the anticipated journey path by referencing historical information regarding the user's travels (col. 3, line 59-col. 4, line 50). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. are related to determining the anticipated journey path; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically determining the anticipated journey path for the user including estimating the anticipated journey path by referencing historical information regarding the user's travels as taught

by Bahl et al. for purpose of determining the user path based on user profile in order to provide the downloaded information of the future journey path.

Regarding claim 12, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 11. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala fail to explicitly show wherein downloading includes receiving the previously stored preferences from the user. However, Bahl et al. teach in figure 7B, wherein downloading includes receiving the previously stored preferences from the user (col. 8, lines 4-65). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. are related to information of user based on user profile; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically downloading including receiving the previously stored preferences from the user as taught by Bahl et al. for purpose of determining the user path based on user profile in order to provide the downloaded information of the future journey path.

Regarding claims 13 and 14, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 11. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala fail to explicitly show wherein downloading includes receiving the previously stored preferences or receiving part of the previously stored preferences from a database that is remote from the user. However, Bahl et al. teach in figure 7B, wherein downloading includes receiving the previously stored preferences or receiving part of the previously stored preferences from a database that is remote from the user (col. 11, lines 37-48 and col. 8, lines 4-65).

Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. are related to information of user based on user profile; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically downloading including receiving the previously stored preferences or receiving part of the previously stored preferences from a database that being remote from the user as taught by Bahl et al. for purpose of speeding up the downloading information process of providing differently and continuously wireless communication services to the user while moving between different mobile networks, services areas or location areas in order to enhance advantageously the quality and reliability of wireless communication services.

Regarding claim 49, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 1. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala fail to expressly teach wherein determining that a user in a first geographic zone is at least likely to leave the first geographic zone and enter a second geographic zone includes detecting that the user has previously passed at least one predetermined geographic location. However, Bahl et al. teach in figure 7B, wherein determining that a user in a first geographic zone is at least likely to leave the first geographic zone and enter a second geographic zone includes detecting that the user has previously passed at least one predetermined geographic location (col. 11, lines 50-59). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. are related to detecting predetermined geographic location; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically determining that a user in a first geographic zone being at least likely to leave the first geographic zone and enter a second geographic zone includes detecting that the user has previously passed at least one predetermined geographic location as taught by Bahl et al. for purpose of predicting the user path based on user profile in order to provide the downloaded information of the future geographic area.

Regarding claim 50, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 49. Bahl et al. further disclose wherein detecting that the user has previously passed at least one predetermined geographic location includes detecting that the user has previously passed at least two predetermined geographic locations (fig. 7B and col. 11, lines 50-59).

Regarding claim 51, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 49. Bahl et al. further disclose wherein detecting that the user has previously passed at least one predetermined geographic location includes detecting that the user has previously passed the at least one predetermined geographic location within a predetermined period of time (fig. 7B and col. 11, lines 50-59).

Regarding claims 52, 53 and 54, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 49. Bahl et al. disclose detecting that the

user has previously passed at least one predetermined geographic location (fig. 7B and col. 11, lines 50-59). But, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. do not particularly show automatically accessing a navigation device, a global positioning system navigation device and a dead reckoning navigation device as used by the user. However, the examiner takes official notice that a navigation device, a global positioning system navigation device or a dead reckoning navigation device are extremly well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. by specifically accessing a navigation device, a global positioning system navigation device or a dead reckoning navigation device as used by the use for purpose of adapting those well known devices in detecting predetermined geographic location in order to improve the quality and reliability of wireless communication service

Regarding claim 55, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 1. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala fail to expressly teach comprising up-loading at least some user information. However in analogous art, Bahl et al. teach in figure 1, comprising up-loading at least some user information (col. 3, lines 45-53). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. are related to wireless communication; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically up-loading at least some user information as taught by Bahl et al. for purpose of offering

the user the capability of transferring the user information to the communication network by up-loading.

Regarding claim 56, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 55. Bahl et al. further disclose wherein up-loading at least some user information includes uploading at least an intended destination for the user (col. 3, lines 45-53).

Regarding claim 57, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 55. Bahl et al. further disclose wherein up-loading at least some user information includes uploading at least an estimated time at when the user enters the second geographic zone (col. 3, line 61-col. 4, line 6).

Regarding claim 58, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 55. Bahl et al. further disclose wherein up-loading at least some user information includes up-loading at least an intended travel route for the user (col. 4, lines 7-50).

Regarding claim 59, Morita et al., Rauhala and Bahl et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 55. Bahl et al. further disclose wherein up-loading at least some user information includes up-loading at least a wireless telephonic contact number for the user (fig. 1 and col. 7, lines 40-55).

7. Claims 15, 16, 32, 36-39, 68 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in view of Rauhala and futher in view of Dowling et al. (US-6,522,875).

Regarding claim 15, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 4. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala fail to expressly teach wherein downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone as is contained in the database includes downloading at least weather forecast information for at least a part of the second geographic zone. However in analogous art, Dowling et al. teach wherein downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone as is contained in the database includes downloading at least weather forecast information for at least a part of the second geographic zone (col. 5, lines 3-18). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. are related to downloading journey-related information; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically downloading only a portion of the journey related information regarding the second geographic zone as being contained in the database includes downloading at least weather forecast information for at least a part of the second geographic zone as taught by Dowling et al. for purpose of providing additional information to the user in order to increase the use of wireless communication service.

Regarding claim 16, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 15. Dowling et al. further disclose wherein downloading at least weather forecast information for at least a part of the second geographic zone includes downloading at least weather forecast information that corresponds to an anticipated journey path for the user (col. 5, lines 3-18).

Regarding claim 32, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 31. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly show wherein storing the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone in a memory includes storing the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone in a cache memory. However in analogous art, Dowling et al. teach wherein storing the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone in a memory includes storing the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone in a cache memory (col. 16, lines 32-36). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. are related to downloading journey-related information; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically storing the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone in a memory includes storing the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone in a cache memory as taught by Dowling et al. for purpose of making easier for the user in access the downloaded information in order to improve the friendly use of wireless communication service.

Regarding claim 36, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 1. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala fail to expressly teach wherein downloading comprises downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria. However, Dowling et al. teach wherein downloading comprises downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria (col. 17, line1-col. 18, line 54). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. are related to downloading journey-related information; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria as taught by Dowling et al. for purpose of providing restrict information to the authorized user.

Regarding claim 37, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 36. Dowling et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria includes downloading to the user pursuant to userbased downloading criteria that includes encryption information (col. 17, line1-col. 18, line 54).

Regarding claim 38, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 37. Dowling et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes

encryption information includes downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes encryption information comprising an encryption key (col. 17, line1-col. 18, line 54).

Regarding claim 39, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 36. Dowling et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to the user-based downloading criteria includes downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data format specification (col. 8, lines 45-56 and col. 17, line1-col. 18, line 54).

Regarding claim 68, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 60. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly show wherein the downloading means includes means for downloading the journey-related information to the user pursuant to user based downloading criteria. However, Dowling et al. teach wherein wherein the downloading means includes means for downloading the journey-related information to the user pursuant to user based downloading criteria (col. 17, line1-col. 18, line 54). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. are related to downloading journey-related information; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically having wherein the downloading means includes means for downloading the journey-related information to the user pursuant to

user based downloading criteria as taught by Dowling et al. for purpose of providing restrict information to the authorized user.

Regarding claim 69, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 68. Dowling et al. further disclose wherein the user-based downloading criteria includes at least one of encryption information (col. 17, line1-col. 18, line 54), data format specifications (col. 8, lines 45-56 and col. 17, line1-col. 18, line 54), data compression specifications, and data presentation specifications.

8. ***Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in view of Rauhala and futher in view of Granberg et al. (US-6,101,387).***

Regarding claim 20, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose the process as recited in the rejection of claim 19. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala fail to expressly teach wherein completing the downloading includes completing the downloading using a second communications service, which second communications service is different from the first communications service. However in analogous art, Granberg et al. disclose wherein completing the downloading includes completing the downloading using a second communications service, which second communications service is different from the first communications service (col. 3, lines 17-60); therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala as taught by Granberg et al. for purpose of offering more

than one communication network of capability in transmitting the information to mobile communication device.

Regarding claim 21, Morita et al., Rauhala and Granberg et al. disclose the process as recited in the rejection of claim 20. Granberg et al. further disclose wherein completing the downloading using a second communications service includes completing the downloading using a second communications service comprising a cellular telephony system (fig. 1).

9. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. in view of Rauhala and further in view of Kamada (US-2002/0123336).

Regarding claim 35, Morita et al. and Rauhala disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 33. But, Morita et al. and Rauhala do not particularly disclose downloading includes downloading to the user at least some journey related information regarding the second geographic zone wherein at least some of the journey-related information includes a corresponding data-expiration time; and automatically removing at least portions of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone as the user travels through the second geographic zone includes automatically removing portions of the journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone for which the data-expiration time has expired.

However, Kamada teaches wherein downloading comprises downloading information including a corresponding data-expiration time and automatically removing

downloaded information for which the data-expiration time has expired [0023]. Since, Morita et al., Rauhala and Kamada are related to information downloading; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al. and Rauhala by specifically downloading information including a corresponding data-expiration time and automatically removing downloaded information for which the data-expiration time has expired as taught by Kamada for purpose of controlling the downloading information in order to reduce the cost of information.

10. Claims 40-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morita et al. and Rauhala in view of Dowling et al. and further in view of Burton et al. (US-2002/0055878).

Regarding claim 40, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 36. But, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. do not explicitly disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes data compression information. However, Burton et al. teach wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes data compression information [0017]. Since, Morita et al., Rauhala, Dowling et al. and Burton et al. are related to information downloading; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. by specifically downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes data

compression information as taught by Burton et al. for purpose of transferring the information by downloading much faster and securer.

Regarding claim 41, Morita et al., Rauhala, Dowling et al. and Burton et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 40. Burton et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes data compression information includes downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes data compression information comprising a specific type of data compression [0169].

Regarding claim 42, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 36. But, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. do not explicitly disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to the user-based downloading criteria includes downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification. However, Burton et al. teach wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification ([0017]-[0020]). Since, Morita et al., Rauhala, Dowling et al. and Burton et al. are related to information downloading; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. by specifically downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation

specification as taught by Burton et al. for purpose of making easier and faster for the user in access the downloaded information.

Regarding claim 43, Morita et al., Rauhala, Dowling et al. and Burton et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 42. Burton et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification includes downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification specifying at least one visual display of information [0017].

Regarding claim 44, Morita et al., Rauhala, Dowling et al. and Burton et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 43. Burton et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification specifying at least one visual display of information includes downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification specifying at least one textual display of information ([0017]-[0028] and [0169]-[0182]).

Regarding claim 45, Morita et al., Rauhala, Dowling et al. and Burton et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 42. Burton et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification specifying at least one visual

display of information includes downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification specifying at least one graphic display of information ([0017]-[0028]).

Regarding claim 46, Morita et al., Rauhala, Dowling et al. and Burton et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 42. Burton et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification includes downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria that includes at least one data presentation specification specifying at least one audible conveyance of information [0369].

Regarding claim 47, Morita et al., Rauhala and Dowling et al. disclose a process as recited in the rejection of claim 46. Burton et al. further disclose wherein downloading to the user pursuant to user-based downloading criteria includes compressing information [0017] to be transmitted to the user as a function, at least in part, of at least one of the user's processing speed, memory size [0114], and vehicle speed.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 48 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 48, the applied references fail to disclose or render obvious the claimed limitations that the process of claim 1 wherein downloading to the user at least some journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone while the user is at least proximal to an entrance boundary for the second geographic zone includes downloading to the user at least some journey-related information regarding the second geographic zone that has been obtained from other travelers journeying from the second geographic zone.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a) Gouge et al. (US-2003/0208595) disclose adaptable wireless proximity networking.

b) Cao et al. (US-6,446,004) disclose a method for proximity driven activities.

c) Schipper (US-6,198,930) discloses a method for cellphone tracking.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy Q Phan whose telephone number is 703-305-9007. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kincaid G Lester can be reached on 703-306-3016. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Huy Phan

SONNY TRINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner: Phan, Huy Q. AU: 2687 Date: Dec. 31, 2004